

REMARKS

The Office Action of May 29, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Applicant respectfully submits that this response is timely filed and fully responsive to the Office Action.

Claims 1-27 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment, with claims 14-21 and 23-27 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. By the above amendment, claims 1-27 are cancelled, and claims 28-55 are added. No new matter is introduced (see, e.g., original claims 1-13 and 22, FIGs. 1-27 and 30-33 and description in Specification thereof, and Specification, page 10, line 27 to page 11, line 4). Accordingly, claims 28-55 are pending in this application, of which claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55 are independent.

Objections to the Drawings

In response to the objection to FIG. 28, as not being labeled Prior Art, substitute FIG. 28, via Replacement sheet, is submitted herewith. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is respectfully overcome.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

In response to the rejection of claims 1-13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, based on a finding of indefiniteness, claims 1-13 and 22 have been cancelled, and new claims 28-55 have been added to correct the noted and discovered informalities. In addition, the noted terminology is clearly defined in Applicant's Specification, for example, at page 10, line 27 to page 11, line 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully contends that all of the pending claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and no further rejection on such basis is anticipated. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually satisfactory claim language.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

In response to the rejection of claims 1-13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being unpatentable over *Hutton et al.* (USP 6,513,066) in view of *Sandegren* (USP 6,512,930),

claims 1-13 and 22 have been cancelled, and new claims 28-55 have been added. Applicant respectfully contends that independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55 and claims dependent therefrom are clearly patentably distinct over *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*, taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons advanced below.

**Hutton et al. and Sandegren Fail to Teach or Suggest the Claimed Invention**

Applicant respectfully contends that *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element defined by the pending independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55 and claims dependent therefrom. For example, independent claim 28 recites:

wherein the second communication device is connected with the first communication device by **obtaining from the host device primary connecting information for connecting to the first communication device;**

wherein when the first communication device prefers a direct call from the second communication device in the future, the first communication device sends to the second communication device identity information for identifying one of an identity for an operator of the first communication device and an identity for the first communication device, **the identity information including none of the primary connecting information;**

independent claim 29 recites:

connecting the second communication device with the first communication device by **obtaining from the host device primary connecting information for connecting to the first communication device;**

when the first communication device prefers a direct call from the second communication device in the future, sending to the second communication device identity information for identifying one of an identity for an operator of the first communication device and an identity for the first communication device by the first communication device, **the identity information including none of the primary connecting information, and the identity information being sent from the first communication device;**

independent claim 30 recites:

receiving means for receiving identity information for identifying one of an identity for an operator of a first communication device and an identity for the communication device itself, and for **receiving primary connecting information for connecting to the first communication device, the identity information including none of the primary connecting information;**

independent claim 54 recites:

primary connecting information generating means for **generating primary connecting information for connecting to the communication device;**

identity information generating means for **generating identity information** for identifying one of an identity for an operator of the communication device and an identity for the communication device itself, **including none of the primary connecting information.**

independent claim 55 recites:

**generating primary connecting information for connecting to the communication device;**

**generating identity information** for identifying one of an identity for an operator of the communication device and an identity for the communication device itself, **including none of the primary connecting information.**

By contrast, *Hutton et al.* is directed to a network system, which provides temporary IP addresses to each of a first communication device and a second communication device, both devices being connected to a mail server 28 during transmittance and receipt of mail between the first and second devices (see, e.g., column 7 line 56 to 57). Thus, the mail server 28 needs to manage the relationship among each of the communication devices and the temporary IP addresses. Thus, the load on the mail server 28 with respect to the communications between the devices is not reduced in the system of *Hutton et al.* In addition, since the mail server 28 must always intervene in communications between the first and second communication devices, intervention by the administrator of the mail server 28 regarding the communications between the first and second communication devices is required.

According to the invention recited in independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55, however, once the host device provides to the second communication device with the primary connecting information for connecting to the first communication device, thereafter, the host device need not handle such primary connecting information. Advantageously, no excessive load is imposed on the host device and intervention by an administrator of the host device regarding the communications between the first and second communication devices is not required.

*Sandgeren* fails to cure the noted deficiencies in *Hutton et al.* and is directed to a wireless communication device, which does not employ primary connecting information (see,

e.g., FIG. 1a) in the manner claimed. Specifically, *Sandegren* discloses notifying a status of an intended party, wherein a user of such a wireless communication device registers a list on which status of desired intended parties is listed (see, e.g., column 3, lines 1-3). Specifically, the user of such a wireless communication device needs to input information for specifying the intended parties on a network on the assumption that such information is known to the user of such wireless communication device. Considering privacy protection and security in communications under such an assumption, *Sandegren* merely discloses a wireless communication device that secures privacy protection and security in communications for third parties other than the intended parties, rather than the intended parties.

According to the invention recited in independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55, however, the primary connecting information is not disclosed to the intended parties. Advantageously, privacy protection can be secured not only for the intended parties, but also for third parties.

Thus, *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element defined by the pending independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55, nor the advantages thereof, such as decreasing the load on the host device, the lack of need for intervention by an administrator of the host device regarding the communications between the first and second communication devices, and the securing of privacy protection not only for the intended parties, but also for third parties.

#### The Dependent Claims are Allowable over *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*

Dependent claim 31-53 are allowable over *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*, taken alone or in combination, on their own merits and for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 30.

#### The Non-Applied References

The references that have been cited, but not applied by the Examiner, have been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since these references were not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to apply against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon is believed to be warranted at this time.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 28, 29, 30, and 54-55 and claims dependent therefrom are clearly patentably distinct over *Hutton et al.* and *Sandegren*, taken alone or in combination. In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 28-55 is earnestly solicited.

Having responded to all rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. An early and favorable Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, the Examiner is courteously requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP



Donald R. Studebaker  
Registration No. 32,815

Date: December 1, 2003

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Customer No.: 22204  
401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 585-5000  
(202) 585-8080 (Fax)

DRS/CRV/crv